

The United Power Line Council (UPLC) in their comments state the following:

"The UPLC is pleased to respond that there has been no interference reported in any of the field trials by its members. These trials have been conducted in accordance with the existing Part 15 limits and measurement procedures. In many cases, the FCC has assisted in the test measurements that have been taken. The experience gained from this process indicates that BPL systems comply with the Part 15 limits, and that the existing rules protect licensed users against interference from BPL systems. If anything, the existing rules may be too stringent and unnecessarily limit the range of BPL, but certainly the emission limits do not need to be reduced to prevent interference. "

It is hard to read the above statement without being skeptical. A small amount of power, even within Part 15 limitations, that is using Power transmission lines will potentially produce dramatic noise and interference to HF (2 MHz to 80 MHz) users including government, commercial, and amateur users. Tests conducted by ARRL and others, including some in Europe have confirmed this fact. Here are some links to sites with test data that contradict the UPLC comments.

<http://www.ce-mag.com/archive/03/ARG/hansen1.html>

<http://www.ce-mag.com/archive/03/ARG/hansen2.html>

http://lists.contesting.com/_topband/2003-August/017333.html

NTIA, even though supportive of the concept, has grave concerns about interference to the users they represent.

Additional evidence of such power line interference can be found within the Commission records themselves. No less than 21 FCC generated enforcement letters have been sent to power companies in the last 12 months alone. And these are just the complaint letters associated with Amateur radio. Imagine how many there would need to be if this rule making is enacted. Here is a link to them.

http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/

I applaud the Commission for considering new technologies in hopes of bringing High Speed services to areas that currently do not have them. However, there are times such as this, when it is more important to consider the devastating impact of such moves on incumbent users. Examples of the impact to incumbent users are listed below. They are but a few of literally thousands of such examples.

For example, Amateur radio operators (ARO) rely heavily on these frequencies to carry on a variety of communications. By utilizing their allocated spectrum, ARO have developed many technologies that we, as a communicating society, rely upon.

ARO activity during the Sept 11th attack and more recently during the North Eastern US blackout should highlight not only the value of Amateur radio, but

the tremendous importance that should be placed on securing and protecting Amateur Radio spectrum from interference and degradation. It is literally a matter of Homeland Security and one that we should all consider fully.

Additionally, one of the tenets of Amateur Radio service is in fostering International Goodwill. The importance of this aspect of radio would be potentially eliminated if BPL is permitted. Since BPL is using 2 to 80 MHz, virtually all international amateur communication emanating from the US would be impaired.

This proceeding, although well intentioned, has the potential to destroy many of the current uses in the 2 MHz to 80 MHz spectrum. I would therefore, for the reasons stated above, urge the Commission to end this proceeding.

Thank you for your consideration of these reply comments.